

REMARKS

In responding to the Examiner's prior art rejections, Applicant here only justifies the patentability of the independent claims (1, 12, 17, and 23). As the Examiner will appreciate, should these independent claims be patentable over the prior art, narrower dependent claims would also necessarily be patentable. Accordingly, Applicant does not separately discuss the patentability of the dependent claims, although it reserves the right to do so at a later time if necessary.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-8, 12, 17, and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yona et al. (U.S.2003/0123537A1, hereinafter Yona). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim independent claims 1, 12, and 17, the Office Action simply reiterates each of the limitations of the claims and states that Yona discloses each of these elements. The Office Action refers to broad sections of the Yona reference, i.e. Figs. 1-6, and paragraphs 0005; 0013-0037; and 0048-0053 as the sections where the recited limitations are disclosed, but the Office Action does not include any explanation or discussion of which teaching in the Yona reference the Examiner perceives as corresponding to each limitation of the claims.

Applicants submit that the Yona reference does not teach every limitation of the independent claims. For example, the Yona reference does not appear to teach the following limitations of claim 1:

converting each one of the two or more compressed video input streams into one or more sub-encoded stream, wherein each one of the sub-encoded streams is associated with a segment in the at least one compressed output stream of the composed layout;
manipulating the one or more sub-encoded streams according to the location of its associated segment in the composed layout of the compressed output stream.

More generally, the Yona reference does not appear to disclose sub-encoded streams or manipulating location-dependent information for sub-encoded streams. Limitations requiring such are included in each of the independent claims. Because the Yona reference does not

appear to teach every limitation of the dependent claims, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

Should the rejection be maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the next Office Action provide a more thorough element-by-element analysis, so that Applicants can understand and respond to the Examiner's position.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 11, 13-15, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yona in view of Wang et al. (U.S. 2003/0099294, hereinafter Wang). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Yona does not appear to teach sub-encoded streams or manipulating location-dependent information for sub-encoded streams. Likewise, the secondary reference Wang does not appear to teach this limitation. Therefore, the combination of Yona and Wang does not render the claims obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Should the Examiner have any questions on this paper, please directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion, reconsideration, and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

May 1, 2006

Date

/Raymond S. Reese/

Raymond S. Reese

Registration No. 47,891

Customer No. 29855

WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH,

RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, LLP

20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600

Houston, Texas 77070

Direct: 832/446-2437

Fax: 832/446-2424